

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, June 3, 1971

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if I just may briefly recap the few comments that I've made on the Personal Investigations Bill before adjournment.

Firstly, the bill extends beyond just the matter of credit reporting and will cover all investigations conducted in connection with a person's application for insurance, employment tenancy, and as I had also indicated, that perhaps one of the most important provisions of the bill is that an individual will be able to find out what the reporting agencies are saying about him and take steps to correct wrong information. This is something which heretofore he had not been able to do regardless of the effects that the report may have had on him and his family.

Individuals who are being investigated, Mr. Speaker, would, under the provisions of this Act, have to be informed either before or after the fact that investigation is being made and they must be informed of their right to protest wrong information contained in a file. Agencies would be required to attempt to verify all information contained in their files or, if they could not verify it, they will then have to remove it. Once every six months any person would be entitled to ask a reporting agency whether it has a file on him and he could also request the information contained in that file, and should he feel that he is not receiving all the information that the reporting company has on him or that the information that the reporting company has is incorrect, the proposed bill would allow him to lodge a complaint firstly with the agency providing the information and if no satisfaction is obtained, then with the Director of the Consumers Bureau who may investigate and take any necessary action.

The proposed legislation also defines under what conditions people have the right to obtain information from a personal report or file; forbids the divulging of the contents of personal reports for unauthorized purposes; and forbids anyone from knowingly providing false or misleading information to people making personal investigations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the proposed Act forbids the making of contracts between the party requesting and the party conducting the investigation which would bind them not to reveal the contents of the report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that there may be some of us who wish there were no reporting agencies and hence no need for the legislation that I've just explained. However, in our modern society where we must almost always borrow money from others, live in accommodation belonging to others, work for others, there is a need for commercial reporting agencies to enable companies, employers, etc., to protect themselves from unnecessarily dealing with bad risks. However, Mr. Speaker, as so often happens in our rapidly developing society, the individual who may be affected by such agencies was virtually forgotten in the process, and hence the need for this legislation to provide long overdue protection for the individual from the methods which business has designed to protect itself. So it's my hope, Mr. Speaker, that members of the House will recognize the importance of this legislation and give it favourable consideration and early passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 45.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK presented Bill No. 45, an Act to amend The Securities Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in this bill there's certain minor amendments to the Securities Act to clear up ambiguities which have manifested themselves; and the other purpose for this bill is to keep our statutes uniform as far as possible with the Ontario Act upon which

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) . . . . our legislation is based and which no doubt gave the leadership to securities legislation across Canada.

Now there is also a need to effect certain changes in view of recent amendments to the Federal Canada Corporations Act, parts of which reflect directly on securities legislation in the province. One amendment contained in the bill is proposed to exempt from the registration requirements of the Act the issuing of stock, the issuing of stock to directors or officers of a company provided that, in the case of a public Manitoba company, the option has been authorized by a majority at a general shareholders meeting called for that purpose. Previously, the Act exempted from registration only stock issued to employees of a company or an affiliated company, provided the employees were not induced to buy by expectation of employment.

Another proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, will clarify the issuance of debentures by hospitals in Manitoba. Presently, the Act states that debentures issued for school, hospital, or similar purposes need not be registered provided they are secured on taxes levied on property. Now although the intent has always been to exempt hospital debentures, a technical problem has arisen because debentures now issued by Manitoba hospitals are secured on money payable to the hospital out of the Manitoba Health Services Insurance fund and the money in this fund is not always derived from taxes levied on property in this province. So the amendment will formally extend exemptions to hospital debentures secured in this way.

A further amendment is proposed to deal with a problem which arose in Manitoba, in the Manitoba Securities Act, as a result of amendments to the Canada Corporations Act which became effective a couple of months ago on the 1st of April of this year. These amendments were foreseen by the draftsmen of the Securities Act and the present Act provides that if the Federal Government passed legislation which was substantially similar to Part X of the Manitoba Securities Act - that's the part titled "Proxy Solicitations" - the federal Act would then take precedence.

However, it's felt by the Securities Commission that this provision is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. Firstly, a requirement that copies of all proxy forms affecting federal companies in Manitoba be filed here may be circumvented by federal companies. Secondly, the federal provisions are confusing as they apply to proxies issued by some corporations but not others, so the proposed amendment to the Securities Act would exempt from the provisions of that Act all federal companies incorporated by letters patent, because then they would be subject to the federal jurisdiction or the comparable legislation at the federal level and also exempt some other companies incorporated by special or general acts of Parliament.

A new section will be added to provide that the Securities Act will not apply in situations of conflict with the provisions of the laws of Canada. And a further amendment is proposed to require that proxies filed in Ottawa by federally incorporated companies also be filed with the Manitoba Securities Commission.

There is also an amendment proposed to provide for more detailed reporting requirements on private placement, the private placing of a block of shares or other securities to a company or other institutions, the price of which is not less than \$97,000, and this will bring our legislation in line with that of Ontario. It's proposed that more detailed reporting requirements be included in regulation rather than in the bill itself, therefore it's also proposed that the amendments be brought into force on a date fixed for proclamation because time will be needed for the drafting of the regulations.

There are a couple of other basically housekeeping amendments that will bring the regulations governing private company status under the Securities Act in line with the status under the Companies Act, and will bring exemptions from prospectus requirements more in line with registration exemptions in the Act. So as I indicated at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this bill is basically housekeeping in nature and I am looking forward to hearing any comments that honourable members on the other side may have.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of further sums required for the services of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972 and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines, Environmental Management and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it your intention to proceed immediately with the supplementary appropriation? The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The schedule that is contained with the message from His Honour provides for supplementary supply dealing with two specifics. One is the Fishermen's Assistance provision for \$2,300,000; and the Student Aid and Human Resource Development and Student Summer Employment Projects of \$600,000, making a total of \$2.9 million. I might indicate that it is expected that of the \$2.3 million provided for Fishermen's Assistance, one-half will be the requirement for payment by the provincial government, the other half would be expected and authorized to be expended as being the Federal Government's share of this Fishermen's Assistance program. As I understand it, there has not yet been complete acceptance by the Federal Government of the total 50 percent provision of the \$2.3 million, but again it is the intention of the government to spend 50 percent of that amount whether or not the Federal Government makes a full 50 percent contribution of the total, so that although we are asking for authority for the 2.3 million we do not expect to expend more than \$1.15 million plus whatever moneys are received from the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the Ministers of Mines and Youth and Education, are prepared to deal with any specific questions that may be asked relating to each of the two items and I will try to give whatever support they may require in justifying the request that we are now making to this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the matter before the committee is Schedule A, the Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1971 -- Mines and Resources and Environmental Management No. XII: Operations - (b) Water Resources, and a sum of \$2,300,000. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I just would like to understand the procedure. As I understand the Minister of Finance, what he is suggesting is that we pass these estimates at this time and deal with them specifically. Is that correct?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well the procedure as I understand it - and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was I believe a Minister of the Crown for longer than I have been - but as I have been instructed or educated, as I understand it the matter before us now in Supply is the authority to proceed with these two items by way of resolution. Once the committee has discussed it and agrees to pass it, then the two resolutions would be reported out of Supply, out of the Committee on Supply and would be presented to the Speaker, Mr. Speaker. After that there would be a resolution that we go into Committee of Ways and Means at which time the Ways and Means would be discussed, that is the raising of the funds, and after the Ways and Means Committee reports then the resolutions from the Committee of Ways and Means would then be submitted to the House for approval. That, I believe, is the equivalent of first reading of a bill.

Then -- well, the most authoritative person in this room has just shaken his head at the way I described it and I think what he means is that then I would have to bring in the bill to the House, and the bill having passed first reading would then be presented for second reading and then go back into Committee of the Whole House to deal with it as a bill and then come back into the House at the conclusion for third reading.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

I may say specifically to the question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that the bill has not yet been printed and therefore I would not expect - of course I could not bring the bill in today. But if committee is prepared to pass the resolution in Supply and if the committee is prepared to receive it back in Ways and Means, that could be passed today and then we would have to wait until the bill is printed, which may take a day or two, in order to bring it back to the House in the regular form for the various readings which have to take place.

I trust that's a satisfactory explanation, but if it's inadequate then I know I have an authority present who will be able to help me in making a more elaborate answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Chairman, I only have one question to ask the House Leader in this regard, and that is I hope we don't run into the same problem we did the other night about going back into Committee of Supply.

MR. GREEN: . . . Supply now and just continue, even after we pass these resolutions that we will just continue with . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may just explain further. It is my hope that if we can deal with these resolutions then we would continue in Supply until say 9:45, to give us enough time then to go out of Supply and into Ways and Means and out of Ways and Means and complete the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if either the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or the Minister of Finance can indicate whether the proposal of fishermen's assistance as presented to us has been discussed recently, within the last week or 10 days, with the Fishermen's Association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the proposal was discussed before it went to Ottawa and I believe that there has been communication between the department and the Fishermen's Federation - and you know, there are other fishermen than those represented by the Fishermen's Federation. There are fishermen who are not represented by the federation who were also communicated with, but I know that because of the nature of the work programs and matters offered in the program that there have been discussions with them but I can't be aware of the exact nature of them.

MR. SPIVAK: Assuming that the federal proportion of moneys is brought forward - and I'm not sure that we're talking about 50 percent exactly, although if I'm wrong I'd like to be corrected on that; I think we're talking about possibly a higher proportion. -- (Interjection) -- Fifty percent? Well, possibly you'll give us an explanation first then.

MR. GREEN: The hope was to get 50 percent of the total of 2.3 million. The province, if it gets 100 percent in certain areas, will use its leverage of 100 percent to go more than 50 percent in other areas. In other words, so that of the total parcel we'll be dealing with half of the amount that's spent, but the Federal Government may refuse to give us 50 percent in certain areas but if they've given us 100 in others then we'll have a little bit of elbow room and we'll use it.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . getting too involved in the mechanics. May I ask if in the event the \$2,300,000 is available through provincial and federal sources, how does it compare with the requests of the Fishermen's Association and any others that may have had contact with the Provincial Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if parts are going to be 100 percent and part 50 or thereabouts, could we have a further breakdown as to what part the 100 percent will apply to?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to honourable members that I have not got specific commitments on these. I really don't know. If you could give me a purpose to the question, I will try to figure out an answer that will be of assistance to you. The total program was \$2,300,000. The Federal Government may decide to pay 100 percent of \$500,000 worth of it and refuse to pay anything in another area, in which case instead of getting 50 percent of that area the Provincial Government for this year, and depending on what type of program it is, is willing to put up a little bit more money.

It's also the case that there are certain areas of the program which deal with retirement

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . and pension provisions which the Provincial Government can't make a commitment for for 50 percent or 75 percent or any percent, because it's a question of income maintenance which the province is not at this stage prepared to say that we are responsible for the maintenance 100 percent of people who are out of work. It's a step that can't be taken at this stage.

The Honourable Member for River Heights says what is the difference between the amount offered and the amount requested by the fishermen. I don't know. I know that the presentation of the program was shown to the Federation; they expressed mixed feelings about it. Some of it they thought was satisfactory, some of it they thought was not satisfactory. I would assume they would like more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, while we're dealing with the Supplementary Appropriations Act in this respect, I have a letter in my hand from the Mayor of Duck Bay, James Parenteau, and he's asked a question. I've no doubt maybe the Minister has had a copy of this letter but I'll read the letter into the record and maybe the Minister can answer my question.

He says and I quote: "On behalf of the people of Duck Bay and other communities around Lake Winnipegosis, I and the Town Council wish to protest the move by government curtailing fishing privileges previously enjoyed with respect to domestic fishing. As you know, residents of Duck Bay and other communities were allowed a domestic fishing licence. The licence entitled them to set one four inch mesh net to catch fish for personal consumption. Government has abolished this practice for reasons which are not clear. We wish to have this privilege restored for the residents of the Winnipegosis area.

"We do not feel that this move by government has or will affect the situation of diminishing the fish population nor would the restoration of the privilege change the situation significantly. We understand that the test by a government biologist conducted last year indicated that the number of marketable fish, particularly pickerel, was small. It was therefore seen that a net for personal use would catch rough fish mainly and so would not change the situation greatly.

"In many cases, native residents of these communities have fished the lakes for most of their lives and taking fish from the lake is almost considered a natural right. They find that possibly confiscation of equipment seems harsh punishment indeed for one who's caught merely trying to supplement his diet for an abundance of pike and suckers. Would you give this matter your consideration." So I'd ask the Minister, would these people be considered for assistance under this particular Act?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the member table his document, please. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I take it that what the honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is saying is that in effect the government is prepared to offer half of \$1,150,000 to the fishermen whether or not the Federal Government participates. That's what the offer will be. I take it as well that he's not prepared to give us the figures which would indicate the nature of negotiations or discussions that have taken place as to the range of what the fishermen feel they're entitled to, and obviously this is what the government at its maximum position feels it's entitled to. If they are successful with the Federal Government it will be \$2,300,000.

I wonder how the Minister of Finance then will reconcile the basic position of the Budget which would now mean that you are in deficit at least by \$1,300,000 plus the 600, possibly \$2 million. Would you agree on that basic position?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on the record I have not refused to tell the House - the honourable member wasn't here - I did tell the House the nature of proposals which the government was taking 100 percent of, the nature of the proposals which they were taking 50 percent of. I did not indicate -- (Interjection) - Well, you say that I refused to tell you about the state of negotiations with the Federal Government. Your first statement was that I didn't want to tell you about the Federal Government. I did. Well, we'll read it in Hansard tomorrow. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, and you'll read it too. You know, the honourable -- I'll try and make a deal with the honourable . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would remind all honourable members of Rule 37. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I was trying to make a deal with the honourable member. I will sit here

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . and not say a word while he is talking and I ask him to do the same thing and I ask the House to view as to who breaks that deal. Ask the House to watch.

With regard to the fishermen, I have not said that I don't wish to tell the House as to how much the fishermen were asking for and how much we have been offering. I indicated that I don't know any specifics about that. They expressed mixed feelings about the nature of the program. They urged us to go down to Ottawa and try and get it. I would assume - and this is just a general assumption which I make from my intuition which my honourable friend doesn't like - that people who are in those circumstances would be happier if they got more money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the question was asked of me as to how I reconcile the supplementary supply with the Budget, and I have no difficulty doing that by indicating that the Government of Manitoba feels that both of the programs proposed under the - that is before us today - are important and vital in the two particular areas. If the honourable member thinks that that throws the Budget into deficit, if that concerns him particularly, frankly it doesn't concern me to that extent because I feel that within a Budget of over \$500 million we can cope with small changes in any way, and I indicated during the Budget Address we were really talking about an expected expenditure of some \$770 million, as I recall it, that this would not create a problem.

Nevertheless, because the Leader of the Opposition seems to be thinking in traditional pre- . . . terms, then I would respond by stating to him that in the Budget Speech I informed the House that I was expecting that the 1970-71 "current" year would show a surplus of revenue over expenditure of some \$600,000. That \$600,000, together with the accumulated revenue surpluses from previous years, will total \$4.5 million of accumulated surplus, and in accordance with the tradition which has been established by the previous governments and particularly by the former Provincial Treasurer, Duff Roblin, I would have no hesitation, as he apparently had no hesitation, of carrying forward an accumulated surplus into a current year in order to "balance the books". Therefore, there is no question that there is sufficient monies to take care of two very important programs.

Having made this explanation, I'm looking forward to hearing from members of the Opposition, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, as to whether or not he objects to this government being prepared to commit itself to a payment of \$1.150 million for fishermen's assistance or \$600,000 in connection with the Student Summer Employment projects, because that, Mr. Chairman, is the important thing. Shall the proposal of this government be accepted along these lines or shall it not be accepted.

I've made the explanation, and the only additional item I would want to bring to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition is that our credit is exceptionally good, as good as it ever has been. We have currently a credit established with various banks totalling some \$55 million aside from all credits arranged for Crown corporations, and I haven't the slightest concern in the world, Mr. Chairman, that the monies will be available to the government when and as needed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance protesteth too much. You know, it's interesting to hear the Minister of Finance because he's so typical of the members on the Opposite side, for the more they try to appear different the more they are the same. I suggest that the Minister of Finance, like many other members in his party who hold Cabinet positions, have become corrupted by the system and in effect -- (Interjection) -- our system which is now your system. Your system which you are carrying on in the same way, because you know I can recall not too long ago when the Budget Speech took place there was some suggestion that there would be additional expenditures that would have to be spent by government. It was acknowledged. Does anyone seriously think that the two programs that were before us were not considered by the government to be implemented at the time that the Budget and the Estimates were passed or brought into this House? Does anyone suggest that the members on the opposite side did not have any idea that programs such as this were going to have to be introduced? Well, it'll be interesting to hear what the individual -- well, the Minister of Education says on that because it would be interesting. Because if he says that, then I would think we would have to examine possibly in a more detailed way than we were intending the Department of Education Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, these are only two items. I'm sure that there'll be others. If they're

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . not brought by way of supplementary estimates within the time of the House they will come through extra Special Warrants that will take place. -- (Interjection) - And the last 100 years, and I suggest to the Minister of Finance he's carrying on the tradition of the system which he says he challenges but which when put in a position of authority he follows exactly.

But the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, having gone through the speeches and the presentation and the press releases and the statements of the financial position of the province and the fact that we were going to have a surplus, in effect we're not going to have a surplus. We're not going to have a surplus because these particular estimates are to be added to the estimates to be furnished, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there are many more.

Now I would agree that having made this point, the issue at hand is the program involved in the estimates, and it's not my purpose to harangue at length -- (Interjection) - I haven't done this at length for the benefit of the Attorney-General - but harangue at length the curious way the Minister of Finance gave us a lecture on the financial position of the province and his relationship with the banks of the world in dealing with \$2,900,000 worth of estimates. And it's interesting because in effect it proves one point, it proves the basic criticism levelled on the Budget Speech by the Opposition was correct. It was levelled by everyone in the Opposition that the expenditures that were presented by the government were not realistic and that they did not include items that were understandably going to be committed as a result of either programs of necessity or programs that were in operation. And that's interesting, Mr. Chairman, because when we deal with the estimates itself we know that these are only estimates; we know as well that not all the programs are finalized; we know as well that they are projections of what is anticipated. So surely we could have had these kind of estimates included, but the difference would have been that we would not have had the surplus; we would not have had the fanfare; we would not have had the remarks and the publicity attached at the time of the presentation of the budget.

The Minister of Finance says he has to answer it and I'm sure that he will, but if he suggests that his answer is to say that the previous government did it; if his answer is to say that I'm following the tradition of everyone else, that's no answer, because I agree you are following the tradition. I suggest you've been corrupted by the system. You're no worse, no better, you're in fact, with the exception of the fact that you have glasses or not and have a little bit more hair, you remind me very much of the former Minister of Finance who sat I believe in that seat and who, in his application and procedure with respect to the budget, appears to have done the same thing.

Now, on the issue, the question of -- (Interjection) - - he sounds like a . . . Mr. Chairman, let me now deal with the amount of \$2,300,000. My suspicion is that the fishermen are not going to be satisfied with the amount; my suspicion is the fishermen, like any other group who are not in a bargaining position, have got to accept what is given to them by government. This has always been the problem of those people who deal with governments and have to in fact be left to the whims and to the will of a government decision.

My suggestion as well, Mr. Chairman, and my belief, is that the amount that they would want would be the amount that I referred to before in the House, which would be an amount which would reflect the average they received in a period of a ten-year average, an averaging over a ten-year period. The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that that wouldn't reflect truly what the earnings have been. If it's based as this one proposal is based, on the earnings that the fishermen had in the last year or two years before contamination occurred in the lakes, then we know that there was an extraordinary situation; we know that the catch was not great; we know that there was some ecological reason why the fishermen suffered; and it is rather unfair, rather inhumane on the part of the Minister of Finance to negotiate on the basis that he has and to propose this.

This amount has to be accepted on the basis that we're not going to try and withhold this money from the fishermen, but let me suggest that this is not a fair amount. This amount does not reflect what a reasonable person would offer to a group of people who because of circumstances beyond their control have been put into a situation where they must accept rather --well, accept; they may want to haggle, but they're going to have to accept without question - they have no bargaining power - the will of the government, and I suggest that had the government decided as they are going to decide that they are going to have to go into a deficit, it would have been better to have gone into a deficit and to have presented these people

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . with what would have been an amount that would have reflected a humane approach to people who have suffered through no circumstance of their own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I just can't help by being amused by the Leader of the Opposition who spent - may I ask him, may I, Mr. Chairman, ask him how long he was a member of the Treasury Bench for the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Yes please, I'd just like to know.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have fifteen minutes I think to answer that question. -- (Interjection) -- An hour? You can call me Mr. Cass-Beggs. No, Mr. Chairman, I believe I was on Treasury Board for three years - I'm not sure if it was for three years - possibly for three years but I don't think so. I think I was probably on Treasury Board for two years. I'm not sure that Treasury Board operates in the same way as the Management Committee. I certainly know that Treasury Board does not operate as the Management Committee does now operate, or did operate towards the end of our term. My suspicion is that Management Committee probably operates the same way under your administration. The only difference would be Planning and Priorities where you have the other 25 people whom you brought in from all over the world to help in your planning. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know. As a matter of fact it's wonderful. If you would only apply - and I'm answering the question, Mr. Chairman - but if you would only apply the standards of compensation that you've given to your own party faithful who are now working in the government to the fishermen, then the fishermen would receive a fair deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I very much appreciate the manner in which the honourable member responded to my question, so I gather he's been a member of the Treasury Board for some two years. I figure he was a member of Cabinet for longer than that. I know that I was a member of the Opposition longer than he, but I won't be, and that I will be a member of the Cabinet for much longer than he will have been. Nevertheless, he was a member of Cabinet long enough so that no doubt with his ability he's been involved in budget work during the time that he was a member of the Cabinet and therefore he must have been very knowledgeable about how budgets are structured and how budgets are balanced.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that a person who has the slightest knowledge of how one brings together a budget would feel that he has any problem to accommodate within a budget of some \$770 million an amount under \$2 million. I just can't believe that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as a member of Cabinet, one who must have been deeply involved in the whole budget balancing procedure, not to know exactly how one can proceed through the relatively artificial means of arriving at what he calls a balanced budget if one deals in terms of \$770 million and is confronted with under \$2 million.

What he should realize is much more important, and which could come out as a result of discussions with my colleagues who are involved in these particular items, is that it was very important to so program the work which this government wanted to do in relation to the Federal Government as to be prepared to bring in the estimates on these particular programs at a time when it was necessary, but not before it was possible to negotiate to the fullest extent possible by the time limitation with the Federal Government, and I believe - and my colleagues will be able to elaborate if they wish to - that there was within their minds the importance of being free to negotiate without being tied to a budgetary effort.

On that basis, I doubt very much if they could have come up with a figure such as they've done today during the budget process itself, because they were yet only starting to explore the manner in which they could obtain full federal assistance for two programs, both of which can be considered of an emergency nature, neither of which our government would want to consider of an ongoing or repetitive nature, and therefore it seems to me that it has been presented to this House at the proper time, neither too early nor too late, but at a time when it can be dealt with on the proper basis. Having said that, I'm only talking about the budgetary process of which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should be so familiar because he's been involved for so long, and longer than I.

He has made some mention that I sound very much like my predecessor. I have never felt that in presenting reports, financial reports, that I have to in some way be different. I may have certain physical differences, I may have a difference in style, but certainly when one presents financial figures one presents them, and I only accept it, as I did the other day,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . as a compliment if I am able to present it clearly and in such a manner as will be understood by the Opposition opposite. I think that my predecessors, both of them with whom I was in the House, as well as they did, I think it's a compliment. That does not mean I accept their theories or their policies or their programs. The fact is I couldn't, but the style, if that's really what the Leader of the Opposition referred to, I accept as a compliment any similarity he sees between the presentation made by my predecessors and me. To that extent we were able to give clear explanations - at least my predecessors were and I assume I was because of his comparison.

As to the specific programs, I think that we're now dealing with one of them - it seems to me it was explained - I don't believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition opposed the proposal that we be authorized to spend this kind of money for this particular need.

The only other point I'm making is that he seems to stress some idea in his mind that government expenditure has to be at an amount, at a rate, and in a program which is acceptable to the recipients. If that were so, then I think it would be a most peculiar situation, that one puts into a budget what the people who expect to receive the money will receive. If that were the case then I would think that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Fort Rouge would be up in arms, saying you are not paying enough in social assistance as the people who are on social assistance would like to receive, and this is something where they are similarly with the fishermen in a situation where they are victims of an economic structure which has created for them a very unhappy situation. Now it seems to me we would want to proceed to give as much as we think we can within the program and financial limitations available to us to those people who are in need through no fault of their own, and that is what is being proposed in these resolutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I was just called out. I wonder if the Minister of Education -- has he given us . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not on that item.

MR. PATRICK: We're still not on that one. I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister before whether there was a breakdown available, and according to what I understood there was none. However, when I look at Page 1149 of Hansard of May 21, 1971, the Minister was replying to a question put by the Member for Lakeside on a previous occasion, and this was in part the answer. "The Provincial Government proposed to the Federal Government at the end of April of this year a program involving \$2,225,000 in order to provide income support for fishermen who were affected by the mercury closure of commercial lakes. This program was in five parts, including the following elements: First, early retirement, \$248,000; compensation for fishermen who were too old to be involved in any other type of work, 65 and over, \$190,000; a Whitefish Fishery on the north part of Lake Winnipeg which would involve 130 fishermen and no government subsidy - by the way the early retirement would involve 207 fishermen; the compensation program, 100 fishermen; a fisheries development program involving a coarse fishery, an agriculture program, a research and monetary program, would involve 123 fishermen at a cost of 363,000; and (e) miscellaneous projects which would involve 478 fishermen at a total cost of \$1,424,800 and which would have as its element a resource extension program in terms of trying to involve fishermen in other occupations such as pulpwood cutting, wild rice development, things of that nature, and make-work projects as an extension of the winter works program that was offered in the winter of 1971 which would involve 478 fishermen. The total of this program would involve 1,038 fishermen at a total cost of \$2,225,000." Is that the program we're referring to? Is this the amount that we are covering? If that is the case, why the discrepancy of 75,000 and what is that for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member really saying that a few minutes ago he asked me for a breakdown and I said that there wasn't one? Is that what he is saying? Then I ask the honourable member to read Hansard to see what he said. I told him that some parts they've agreed to as 100 percent, that some parts they've agreed to at 50 percent; and the honourable member got up and said, tell us what parts they've agreed to at 100 percent and what parts they've agreed to at 50 percent. I had previously said not more than 10 seconds or thereabout to the remarks that you made that I had specified and outlined this program in

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . the House when the Member for River Heights was not here. You are now reading what I said I outlined to him.

What I said that I couldn't offer you - and you have chosen to use this as an indication that I have in some way misled you - what I said that I couldn't offer you is the amounts that the Federal Government is going to assume 100 percent for, the amounts that we are going to have put in 50 or more percent for down the line. As to the difference between \$2, 225, 000 and \$2, 300, 000, the difference is \$75, 000. That's an estimate -- that is really rounding out the program in an estimate. We are only going to spend that amount that we need. But I really don't think that that \$75, 000 figure is anything more than rounding out what we feel the total program will cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I want to thank the Minister. I would then read another paragraph and ask him whether that offer still stands. I continue: "We have received what we regard as a definite commitment from the Federal Government that they would finance a total 100 percent of the cost of the Fisheries Development Program of \$363, 000. We have also received what we consider a fairly definite commitment again. I underline fairly definite that the Department of Indian Affairs will finance 50 percent of the cost of make-work projects involving Treaty Indians which would be a \$600, 000 portion of the 1.4 million that I mentioned before - that they would finance 50 percent of that which would be \$300, 000, the Province financing the balance." Do these figures still stand?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I gave those figures to the House not more than 10 days ago. Are you asking me whether -- if you'll continue to read you will see that it was difficult to be specific. The Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Member for River Heights wanted a statement. I felt that at that stage I couldn't keep the House waiting any longer, that I had to make a statement even though it couldn't be definitive. I still don't have definite figures but the ones that he has and the ones that I gave him are exactly now as they were when I gave them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: This is what I asked before. I didn't have these figures before me at that time and I asked as to what portion would be 100 percent, what portions would get less amounts, and I couldn't get a reply so I had to dig it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the member insists on saying that I withheld that information from him. I ask him why would I do that? I gave that information to the House. What I said was that I couldn't be definite on the total of 2.3 million and that I had previously announced all of the information that I had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I have again a few remarks with regard to the supplementary amount that we're asked for. I don't think there's anybody on this side of the House that's opposed to the amount or the assistance to the fishermen or the Student Aid Program that's involved in this Act. I have a son who is unemployed today, a university student, but the Minister of Finance - and I'm not going to get into a great debate about economics and things like that, whether old traditions and dogmas are going to be scrapped or whether in fact they're going to be followed ta-da ta-da - but I again appeal to the Minister of Finance about the letter that I have tabled about the people of Duck Bay and along Lake Winnipegosis. While I did get an answer from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources which was a "no", I basically don't understand why you can't include these people in this program.

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't have any problem understanding why the Member for Roblin doesn't understand. As far as I'm concerned, the answer given by the Minister of Mines was no, and I accept that as being the answer.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I will try to indicate to the honourable member because I too agree with my honourable friend and I can understand why he doesn't understand the program. The program that we are dealing with is a program which compensates fishermen for mercury pollution which resulted to their fisheries. The other problems in Manitoba affecting low income groups, fishermen, unemployed workers, people on social assistance, people who are out of work because industrial firms have closed down, people who are out of work because the Prime Minister of this country said approximately 18 months ago that I am going to turn the screws until seven percent of the population is unemployed, that that is not

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . dealt with in this particular program. This deals with the mercury pollution program which we were able to get started last year, which we continued through the winter and which we are now continuing this summer, and the other problems that you raise are certainly not any the less problems but they will not be dealt with in this particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, then I only have one small remark to add to the Minister's remarks, and that all happened from the government's decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution--passed, Youth and Education No. XVI - Appropriation No. 5, Student Aid and Human Resource Development \$600,000 - The Minister of Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition questioned whether and why this amount is being submitted tonight and was not in the Estimates. I think he knows the answer better than I, but he likes to pose the question. You may recall in March, March 15th it was, that the Federal Government trumpeted a new program to help student employment across Canada. It was a big headline: "\$58 million - Opportunities for Youth." Then there was a silence, because the students were given 30 days in which to come up with programs. They were given till April 15th in which to come forward and develop programs and projects which the Federal Government might fund. We then found out that the \$58 million, most of the money was being designated for Militia and travel-oriented programs, that in fact of the \$58 million, \$15 million was to go directly to student job creation.

That \$15 million of course is a Canadian figure, it's not for Manitoba. We calculated that about 800 to 900 thousand dollars might be available to Manitoba and the students responded right across Canada, and Manitoba as well, to such an extent that at the end of April the Federal Government announced another headline that they're going to increase the \$15 million by another \$10 million to make it \$25 million for student jobs, and the deadline for announcements was May 1st. May 1st came and went and we heard nothing. The deadline was then announced to be May 15th and students were waiting patiently to find out whether the programs, the projects had been accepted. May 15th came and it went and we were told May 25th was the target date. May 25th has come and it has gone and last Friday, I don't remember the date, the 28th it was, in Friday's Free Press it was noted that Manitoba has been granted to date \$76,779 worth of student jobs. We were calculating, as I say, one-twentieth - in other words, approximately 1.1 million.

I don't doubt that in time the announcements will come through, these projects will be approved, some of them, and eventually the students will know where they stand, but in the meantime a very serious problem has developed.

It didn't take much of a visionary to know that this year was going to be a very difficult year for students. We know that this last year has seen unemployment in Canada generally, thanks to the federal policies, greater, an unemployment greater than ever before, and it didn't take much of an economist to calculate that when the students of the universities came out into the streets there would be no jobs for them. But it wasn't, as I say, until March 16th that the Federal Government made any announcement whatsoever. But feeling that perhaps Manitoba would get \$800,000 out of a first \$15 million allocated and about \$500,000 of the next \$10 million allocated, we naturally felt, and correctly felt that since this entire crisis was due to federal economic policies, that the onus lay on them to do something about it. The tragedy is that the idea was a good one, that in fact the opportunities for youth program is good but it takes time to develop. It requires lead time, it requires planning time, and above all it requires time for evaluating, and I can well understand whoever is working in Ottawa and trying to figure out what programs to approve and what programs not to approve, I don't envy them their job because they're snowed under.

But I do know we can't wait any longer and I do know that we have to meet this problem and that's why this bill is before you, because by pumping in an extra \$600,000 for student employment we hope we can ease some of the pressures that exist today. I don't think members opposite will disagree that the crisis is a severe one, that student unemployment is severe and that we can't just turn our backs on it, just as this government couldn't turn its back on the winter unemployment when it introduced the PEP Program for \$4 million and helped to ease unemployment in Manitoba so that as a result we had one of the lowest unemployment factors in Canada.

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)

I'm hoping, frankly, that this year with this extra effort on our part, coupled with the programs and projects that will eventually be approved by Ottawa - and hopefully to the extent of the \$1.1 million that I'm led to believe was supposed to be Manitoba's share - this program plus the federal program I am hoping will again put Manitoba in the position where last year we led the nation in 1970, according to the Free Press of February 12th, 1971, quoting DBS statistics in 1970, Manitoba showed the highest rate of post-secondary school student employment in Canada and I am hoping with this program that we can achieve the same thing.

With these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that members opposite will rapidly approve this request for \$600,000 so that students can be put to work.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement made by the Honourable Minister. I noted his emphasis on the many things that the Federal Government is doing wrong and I don't think that any one in this House is not agreeing with him that there are problems. He admitted this and stated so and I think we have to agree that after studying the problem and as he mentioned perhaps four or five different dates were given and still there was no settlement of the sum which is bad enough in itself, there is no question in regards to that. I do think though that Manitoba's government - this government opposite here - made up their mind some time ago that they wanted to do something about the matter and are suggesting a figure here and of course some other figures that will tie in with this amount. I wonder if the Minister would care at this time to give us a bit of a breakdown of what this \$600,000 consists of?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister won't have any trouble finding agreement for the expenditures of \$600,000 for the summer job program for the students. I don't know that I can completely agree with him shifting the blame on the Federal Government for the particular situation that now exists in Manitoba. There seems to be a peculiar bent that this present government is on because we've had nearly every Cabinet Minister in the front row blame their predicament on the Federal Government and now the Minister of Education has joined the pack.

If Manitoba was in fact being done out of their share of the program in Ottawa, either one has to say that there wasn't sufficient promotion of the program in Manitoba or that the Federal Government was in fact deliberately gyping Manitoba. I don't really believe the latter is true, because I think probably they were making it as broad based as possible and it was open to the initiative of the students across the country to partake of the programs, which may well mean that there was not enough directed initiative in Manitoba to muster the program for the students. I don't know exactly who would be to blame in a case like that but I don't think the Minister's department can be completely clear if in fact they weren't mobilized to avail themselves of the Federal Program. Because certainly, if they are getting it in other provinces, it's because they were prepared to mount the programs to get the aid.

Now I don't know what the Minister has in his budget with respect to Student Placement programs. It's not broken out in the budget so there may in fact be additional monies to the \$600,000 and perhaps he would advise us if that is in there. We do know that he has a Student Placement Office and a Student Placement Secretariat and we trust that he'll give us some figures on the jobs that have been allocated to students and the backlog of jobs that they're looking for. But there have been programs in the past; I think the Minister is well aware of them. Programs which in fact that he didn't see fit to carry forward the last two years which offered job opportunity for students. There was a program at the university that was a \$100,000 program proposed last year that he didn't see fit to go along with. It was a 50 - 50 or 70 - 30 program that he was requested to give support to and he refused to give support. This was basically a do-it-yourself program that would have provided 150 jobs in the vicinity of the university for people who couldn't get employment elsewhere.

So other than that, Mr. Chairman, we haven't really had - up to this date it's been very difficult to get information from the Minister of Education on what has been happening. The questions that have been asked in the House have usually been either taken as notice or we get a "soon" answer to it and we're still, even after the introduction of this \$600,000 we don't know what his program is. All we know is that it's a shotgun program that has been brought in at the last minute and has been blamed on the Federal Government and he has exonerated himself of all responsibility on this matter up till now and now he's going to save the day. Well I think we'll be happy to support him to try and save the day but I don't think he's completely justified why he's coming in here with a shotgun program at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what the Minister had to say and according to the way I understood it - are we assuming now that this \$600,000 estimate that is before us is based on a Press report, on a Free Press report? This is what I got out of it, that here we didn't have anything else to base it on than a Press report. Has there been any confirmation from the Federal Government that this is going to be matched and that we will get the other portion from them; and also as the Member for Riel has mentioned, what kind of

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . . a program are we putting on for this type of money?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I enjoy listening to the Member from Riel because when he has nothing to say he tries very very unconvincingly to somehow twist daggers in people and somehow try to becloud the issue and raise red herrings. He knows about this program as every member here does. I'm talking about the Federal Opportunities for Youth Program. The Federal Government attached a condition to this program and the condition was that they would not deal with the provincial governments or municipal governments, that the programs, the work projects had to be conceived by the students or community groups and then had to be submitted to Ottawa. And if the honourable member is wondering at all whether Manitoba lost out in the sense of applications and projects, I have news for him. There's enough applications for Manitoba, before the deadline of April 15th, to have spent \$3 million worth of Federal money; so that there's no question they had more than enough programs and more than enough projects. And I did not say that Manitoba was getting less and that the money had been spent elsewhere. They're in the same boat everywhere. I have talked to my colleagues in other provinces and I can tell you that in the other provinces they are equally as behind schedule in finding out what projects have been approved, what projects haven't been approved. We have tried and we have worked with the Federal Government and in talking to the Secretary of State I offered to make myself available or any members of my staff for any support that they might need in order to check on a project that was put forward by students here or by any community group to help them in evaluating the program. We have even gone so far as to suggest that where there was any question about funding all of the program because the program perhaps covered more than just the kind of student work that was conceived by the Federal Government in its guidelines, that Manitoba would be prepared to lend support in order to help the program go forward. So Manitoba has not gotten less than other provinces. The problem is that the program has bogged down, period, and this applies across the country. This 600,000 as I see it, will be spent in two ways: One, it will be an expansion of the Student Placement Program which is operated through the Student Placement Office which was referred to earlier; of projects conceived within the Provincial Governments to do socially, useful jobs, work.

The Member from Riel made reference to a program last year which the government did not want to participate in, because frankly when it came to spending dollars I felt that if we were going to spend 30 or 40 or 50 thousand dollars, I wanted it to be spent on socially useful work and not to give students money no matter how much they would like to do it, that is to receive the money, simply put them to work working on bibliographies for professors for some work which may never see the light of day. I don't doubt that the professors involved would enjoy it and would love to have the students do it for them and the students might even enjoy doing it, but when you have limited funds you try to make those dollars work not only for the students but for others as well. When we come to our estimates I'll explain to him how a program was run at Cranberry Portage for 240 core city students which paid the salaries for 36 students and also made it possible to have a program for children who would otherwise have been denied that program. That's an example of the kind of work that's done. These are in-house programs. So that some of this 600,000 will be utilized within the Provincial Government to back up certain programs in various departments, whether it be through the Recreation Department, whether it be Health and Social Development, Mines and Natural Resources, Highways, etc., where we can find work, where certain work could go ahead and could be valuable to the province and to the students, we will help to fund those.

We will also, I say this hopefully, we will also be financing a number of the worthwhile projects that were submitted by Manitoba students but were rejected because the Federal Government eventually will run out of the funds because they don't have nearly enough for the program, and so hopefully we'll be able to pick up some of those projects; and I say hopefully because the danger is that at the rate that the Federal Government is processing these projects, the students may be back at school before the final projects are known. But if we do get word, and I hope within the next two weeks this should come about, I can't see how they can delay any longer, once we do get word and we know what projects have been accepted for Manitoba, what projects have been rejected - not because they aren't good but simply because the \$25 million to be spent across Canada has been spent; at that point we will try to use some of these funds to pick up some of the better programs which simply couldn't be funded by the Federal program.

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)

So this is generally how the \$600,000 is going to be spent, and it's this 600,000 which appears in my estimates under, I think it's 5 (d) were in the estimates as \$100,000, it'll be this \$600,000 plus the \$100,000 shown in the estimates which in total will go into - which? -- (Interjection) -- (b) or (d), I forget where it is - it may be (b) - which will go to make a total of \$700,000 to be used for Student Summer Employment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I only have one very brief question, Mr. Chairman. I don't mind blaming the Federal Government when it's a justified matter, but there's a little confusion here that I can't understand and it might be that I can't think as quickly or as straight as some members can. I'd like to know whether it is that Manitoba did not get its fair share or did it, or is it rather that the Federal Government did not pay the 25 million that they announced? It has to be one or the other.

MR. MILLER: I can answer that. The 25 million has not yet been allocated anywhere across Canada and Manitoba therefore didn't get its share. It's not that Manitoba has got less than other provinces; we won't know that until all allocations have been made; but what I'm saying is that the Federal program has bogged down in the administrative load because you can't launch a program like this on March 16th. This is a shocking thing because everyone knew and everybody could foresee that student unemployment was going to be of a crisis nature this year and yet they waited until March 16th, a month before most universities are out before this program was announced and gave them 30 days in which to submit the projects. And the remarkable thing is the students responded in 30 days. It's now June 3rd; the Federal Government is taking twice as long as the students. The students had a conceived program and submitted them; the Federal Government has taken twice as long to simply check them over and approve or disapprove; it's taken them twice as long to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'm still not sure who submits these projects for approval. Is it the Department? Well, how can the students get together and set up a project, and when was the first project mailed in for approval?

MR. MILLER: Isn't it amazing what students can do apparently. You're simply underscoring what I said. The program was launched, it was announced it would not be operated through the Provincial Government, it was not to be tied into provincial government programs or municipal programs or any other level of government, but rather it was to be programs conceived by students and community groups; they had to do it and they've done it, and there's more than enough programs sitting on Ottawa's desk to cover all the 25 million plus another 25 million besides.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister also indicated I think when he was speaking that we may get an answer on the numbers of students that had been placed through his placement service this year, and what sizes backlog of applications there are for the jobs. Does he have any figures on this?

Secondly, he's referred to in-house programs and I don't think we can probably ask him to explain all the programs of other departments that he's going to finance, but he must have some further grasp if he's at the position of coming in here on the 3rd of June to ask for \$600,000.00. He doesn't really sort of persuade anybody that he's on top of the situation on June 3rd any more than the Federal Government was on March 15th with their program unless he can give us better detail on the specific programs that he's talking about and the numbers of students that he wants to try and place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, last year the province placed 1,758 students in the provincial service; to date - and these figures can't be up to date for two reasons: one, the programs that the Federal Government is operating, or under the aegis of the Federal Government, we don't know the numbers involved; we won't know until all the figures are in. But of the students that we ourselves are trying to handle through the Student Placement Office, to date, as of May 25th I think it is, 625 students, and this does not include the Crown corporations, which we don't have any figures on as yet, nor does it include the branches, the districts, nor the hospital operations outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg, nor does it include information which has not yet reached the Student Placement Office; because the way the Student

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . Placement Office operates is this. We are asked by a department for 10 students to perform a certain job; the Student Office submits names and advises the students to go down to see somebody or to report to somebody and discuss it with them and they may hire them or if they feel they're not qualified they may not; we send more than probably are needed, because they pick and choose, and then we're not really notified finally what the answer is or how many have been taken on until perhaps weeks later, so the final figure on what we place this year will not be known until the end of the summer because departments don't fall all over themselves filing returns; this is not their function and they're not in that great a hurry to do it. But I can tell you that as of the last week in May or prior to the last week in May we knew of 625 that had been placed. We expect that the moment this 600,000 is made available, we know of about 300 more that can be immediately put to work and the others will follow probably within the next two weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's most gratifying to hear the figures that are released by the Minister of Youth and Education when he tells us that 625 students as of the last week in May have been placed. I've been asking this question at various intervals during this session and also through the last session, and I find, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's figures are not entirely accurate at various times. For instance on the 12th of May he gave me the figures as of that date that there were 233 students placed, and on the 26th I asked him and he said as of two and a half weeks previous it was 433, so that there's a great deal of discrepancy in my mind about the figures that the Minister releases to the House and sometimes I question whether he really knows what he is talking about here, because the figures that he gives at time to time in this House just don't add up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution—passed; Schedule A—passed. Matter under consideration is Resolution No. 68 and an amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, there are a few things that still remain to be said on the Minister's Salary. I'd like to say it once again by simply reciting a few of the remarks that the Minister has made when he was in Opposition. I do this because I think it's necessary for it to be listed in the record. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will rise and will do his best to defend his position, because I think he finds himself in a very difficult position, because he — (Interjection) — Yes, as the First Minister does — all we had to do was listen to his remarks with respect to Western Flyer to realize what a difference it makes when you're in government and when you're in Opposition; and all we have to do is listen to the Minister of Finance and read what he has said in the past to realize that situations when they change cause the kind of bending in views that give rise to a certain skepticism about the credibility of the government and of the positions of its Ministers and warrant the consideration that's given with respect to the Minister's Salary.

Now on May 2, 1969 on Page 1853 of Hansard, the Minister of Finance said, and I quote: "Shouldn't we keep our options open, because in the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, we won't be able to go back to a low level diversion; we won't be able to undo the damage that we are doing now whereas the reverse is true. One of the educations, Mr. Speaker, that I've had in life is that when you have a course of action to take, one of which leaves you two alternatives and one of which leaves you no alternative, you take the course that leaves you an option." Who said that? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm sorry — that was a Freudian slip. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and it's interesting — (Interjection) — why comment? Except that when it applies to a situation and when you have two alternatives what do you do, you take the alternative that doesn't leave you any option. That really was the complaint of Mr. Campbell before the committee today. And while I am not — (Interjection) — well, yes sree, that was the complaint. Mr. Chairman, he indicated to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and to members of the committee that Hydro was going to proceed with the Churchill diversion, and that the question is whether you control Lake Winnipeg now or you hold your option open, and he suggested that the option should be held open. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister who in Opposition . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister, to a point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I trust the Leader of the Opposition doesn't mind if one raises what he believes to be a valid point of order. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . . to be some agreement as to whether - if we are discussing Hydro matters now under the Department of Mines and Resources, that's all right providing there is an understanding then that we don't cover the same ground at some subsequent time when Hydro matters are properly before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. On the point of order? The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . the First Minister would leave the strategy for the Opposition to be determined by the Opposition. — (Interjection) — I'll continue on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and possibly the First Minister may have something to say on the point of order.

We are discussing the Minister's Salary and in my remarks prior to introducing a resolution to have the Minister's Salary reduced, I indicated that he had not carried out his trusteeship with respect to the resource of Lake Winnipeg. We are dealing now with the control and regulation of Lake Winnipeg and I'm suggesting while dealing only with the Hydro matter in a peripheral manner, I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that in effect we are talking about the fact that the Minister has allowed the option, that he was prepared to protect when in Opposition, that option and that alternative to go, because once Lake Winnipeg is controlled it is controlled. We know that there are experts who -- I'm sorry, this is on the point of order and I have already commenced into discussion, I would rather . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the Chair has an opinion on the point of order. There has been much latitude allowed in this particular debate in bringing in Hydro. Now in other jurisdictions where people are summing up before the Bar they may be allowed a certain type of latitude, but the rules of this House are under control of this House and this Chair is required to protect the 57 members of this House and the Chair will interpret what is relevant and irrelevant. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to make his remarks relevant to the Minister's responsibility even if he does allude to Hydro. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The Minister's responsibility, Mr. Chairman, was to inform the First Minister and his colleagues that Lake Winnipeg was not to be controlled but rather that the Churchill diversion should be proceeded with because that option would be left open until later, and that would have been consistent with his position when in Opposition. That is point No. 1, Mr. Chairman.

I've already had the opportunity and I do not think it's necessary to read it into the record again the statements of the Minister contained on Page 1850 of Hansard in which he indicated that the theory of the court was verdict first, trial afterwards, and surely, Mr. Chairman, this is what we have with Lake Winnipeg regulation. We have an interim licence granted, we are going to have a tender for construction of the controls accepted and work commenced, then we're going to have hearings. Surely we are following the procedure of verdict first, trial afterwards.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources shakes his head. He has said this in the committee, and I suggest that any rationalization that would indicate that once work is begun on the control of Lake Winnipeg that we are not proceeding, when we have hearings afterwards - if we are going to have hearings - when we have hearings afterwards, we are proceeding with a trial after a verdict has been decided. Because - and again I have to make reference to the remarks of Mr. Campbell - Mr. Campbell indicated that it was his belief, and I think that weight should be given to his opinion, that those people who are cottage owners on Lake Winnipeg will rise up and will see to it that the time the Water Commission deals with the hearings after the fact, after the verdict, that they will impress upon the Water Commission the necessity of controlling the lake at a level that will not need the power requirement, and for that reason the control of Lake Winnipeg under the present circumstances is not warranted. — (Interjection) — Yes?

MR. SCHREYER: Is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition aware that for the past half a decade, and slightly more in fact, that the level of Lake Winnipeg during summer and early fall months has in fact been above the proposed 715 maximum and therefore that there is a higher level which people would want to avoid by means of regulation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I must inform the First Minister we are now talking about the Hydro requirement of maintaining a level of 715 constant, or pretty well constant. Well -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, it's interesting because the First Minister is presenting an argument which I think properly should be presented at a hearing before the verdict is brought in. And that really is the point. We've had a verdict, then we're going to have a hearing. We have a

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . disagreement between ourselves. We have a disagreement between a presentation of Mr. Campbell on this one matter, and I would suggest that if witnesses were allowed to be called before the committee or allowed to be called before a hearing prior to this verdict being given, that we would have sufficient technical information to warrant serious consideration and a judgment being made based on facts and information that would be provided properly.

And it's interesting because I want to go back to the words of the Minister on Page 1368 of this year's Hansard when he said: "I indicated to the First Minister when the licence was granted that we would have to have a series of meetings, that those meetings would determine just what is the pattern of regulation, and whether the Hydro's pattern is a satisfactory one and what should be the result of the effects of the regulation as given by people who came to me here." Very democratic. We are going to have a series of meetings and we're going to determine the pattern of regulation. That's after we've made the decision to control Lake Winnipeg, after we've committed ourselves to \$50 million, when it may very well be, Mr. Chairman - and this was Mr. Campbell's point - that the evidence presented will warrant the Water Commission seeing to it that the lake is at a level lower than the requirement for Hydro which would mean that the \$50 million would be wasted. This is inconsistent with the position taken by the Minister in Opposition of verdict first and trial afterward. And through you, Mr. Chairman, to the First Minister and to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, may I say that on this matter it's verdict first and trial afterwards.

Now on Page 1852, May 2nd of 1969, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said and I quote: "But what the Minister now says, Mr. Speaker, is that when they decided on the technocrat's program in 1966 - on the technocrat's program in 1966, without study, that they already decided that the lake was to be flooded and the diversion would take place." Now who's the technocrat today? The technocrat is Mr. Cass-Beggs, because it's his interpretation of the Task Force that the government relies on. -- (Interjection) -- well, we -- a very important point. The First Minister says the Task Force, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the First Minister, that they're relying on the Chairman's interpretation of the Task Force, and that given the opportunity for public hearings that there would be sufficient technical evidence brought forward that would indicate that the Task Force did not come to the conclusion that the chairman has come to and on which the government is relying. And surely if we're going to have trial first and verdict afterwards, we should follow that procedure.

Well, the First Minister laughs and probably it's a laughing matter at this time, but to those people on the Lake Winnipeg who are going to be affected by the government action first, at which time several months later there'll be hearings, what are they going to do about it at that time in any case? Because after all, \$50 million will have been committed of public money. Does anyone seriously think that after the government has committed this - you know, the \$50 million, that we are going to have the kind of discussion, hearings that will in fact balance the interests of everyone concerned of a pattern? Surely a Minister who in Opposition argues the other way would have seen to it that in the handling of his own trusteeship that he would have at least impressed on his colleagues the necessity of having the kind of hearing and opportunity for debate before a decision to control or regulate Lake Winnipeg would take place.

On Page 585 of March 20th of 1969, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stated and I quote: "Now, Mr. Chairman, one can't really argue that the public representatives of the people shouldn't be responsible for doing this thing, and I think the public representatives of the people ultimately always have to accept the responsibility for what goes on. I think the Minister would agree that the proper way of determining in a case of this kind whether a licence should or should not be granted would be to have technical people providing an independent tribunal with the facts so that those facts could at least be recommended in some independent form to the Legislature. That's why we have such things as royal commissions from time to time because it's recognized that the subject matter at hand is too difficult to be discussed by normal debate in the Legislature without some preliminary fact finding and where has this occurred."

Well, you know the Task Force is not the independent body that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is talking about. The Task Force is a body of Hydro officials, and either he is going to be consistent and agree that there should be an independent technical enquiry or he would agree that the Task Force Report should at least be allowed to publicly be debated by those people who are the experts in this field and who can present their positions

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . with respect to the issue at hand.

And that's very interesting, because again I would request, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that control of Lake Winnipeg should not be commenced until we've had an opportunity to have Professor Kuiper before the Public Utilities Committee so that we can hear his evidence. Certainly the Minister has indicated that he's talked to him at great length on South Indian Lake and he knows his views. I think it would be interesting to hear his views on Lake Winnipeg. We know from the transcript that we have of his appearance on television that he disagrees with Mr. Cass-Beggs. As a matter of fact, he has some basis on which to make his judgment but it appears Mr. Cass-Beggs has not, and it would . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret to interrupt the member but the Minister of Finance did have an agreement that the Committee would proceed on these two resolutions and then do Committee of Ways and Means. I wonder if it is still the intention to proceed in that manner?

MR. GREEN: . . . member is going to finish in two minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I intend to finish in a few moments. I think the point has been made and I'd like to, if I may, quote from Page 1849 of May 2nd, 1969. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stated and I quote: "And I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we were faced with a prospect of a similar lake in Manitoba being permanently destroyed by flood waters which we could avoid - and I put the qualification - which could be avoided by the expenditure of \$5 million, we'd be yelling 'crisis', we'd be yelling 'disaster', we'd be going to Ottawa, we'd be asking for a contribution for the money, but we would save a lake and the government would do it and the Opposition would help them."

Well, do we have a similar situation? The argument will be Lake Winnipeg is a similar lake to South Indian Lake. It's not being destroyed, but realistically there's tremendous investment, and I would think thousands and possibly hundreds of thousands of people in Manitoba will be affected by the action of the government -- (Interjection) -- It has. That's a wonderful judgment the Minister has made. But Mr. Campbell disagrees with him, and certainly I can assure him that there are other people who have some technical knowledge that I prevail myself of who disagree with him. And I would suggest for his information, before he becomes that stubborn and that rigid, that he give these people the opportunity to take the information supplied by his own Task Force and by his own study on Hydro, and with that information to listen to them and not be as rigid, because I suggest that we are faced with the prospect of affecting, possibly not destroying, a lake similar to Southern Indian Lake which affects not 600 people but thousands and thousands of people, and there is both a moral and legal obligation on the part of the government to hold those hearings before the control structures are built.

On Page 1848 of May 2, 1969, the Minister stated, and I quote: "Wouldn't this same government come in and say we can stop this, we can save the lake, we can save the Indian population if we allocate \$5 million which is going to save the lake in perpetuity. Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt in my mind that they would do it. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt in my mind that they would get the approval of the Opposition. And I'll prove it to you, Mr. Speaker, I'll prove it to you."

Well, Mr. Chairman, this was the Minister of Finance. I suggest -- the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has had the opportunity to prove it and has failed, because when faced with a situation which will affect hundreds and thousands of people he is not prepared to save the lake, he is not prepared to hold hearings before a judgment is made; he is prepared to follow the basic position that he argued so vehemently when he was on the Opposition of presenting a verdict, giving an interim licence, allowing construction to commence, and then to hold a hearing. This is not just inconsistent with the statements that were made, it's inconsistent with the principles that were expressed by the members on the opposite side and amounts to really sheer hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman, the game of reading back the speeches of the members when they were in Opposition is interesting. We've had this in other debates. We've also had the situations where members will interpret in Opposition statistics one way, members will interpret statistics another way when in government, and we witnessed this in a variety of debates already in this House. But here we have something far more - well, I don't want to go through, and I'm going to have an opportunity when we discuss Western Flyer to go through the statements that

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . the First Minister's made and then we'll see how that game is played - but I say, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, here you've conducted yourself and you've followed a course of action that is basically inconsistent with the principles that you expressed when you were in Opposition and you have in fact attacked your own credibility, and I suggest very strongly your credibility as a person who has reacted and acted on principle with respect to issues, and there is no better situation than the present one where you are taking the position that the interim licence has been granted, the control regulation which will be under construction is not a verdict first, and that the hearings that will happen in the months to come are really a trial afterwards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think we gave my honourable friend two minutes and I don't think I'll be much more than three minutes. We have two situations, and if I ask the honourable members to compare the two situations which my honourable friend says are the same and they can come to the conclusions that they are the same, then they can adopt the reasoning of my honourable friend.

In one case we have a lake which is levelled at 745 feet and a government comes along and says it's going to raise it to 769 feet - no, it's going to raise it by 34 feet - that it is going to raise it by 34 feet, it's going to wipe out a community, it's going to flood thousands and thousands of acres of land. That's one situation, and a person behaves in a certain way with regard to that one situation.

You have another lake whose normal levels are 709 to 717 and you have a program which will bring that lake to 711 which is better than 709, and bring it down from 717 to 715, both extremes being better, keeping it within the normal limits, and my honourable friend says those are the same situations. Well, if those are the same situations, then I have spoken against my principles. If people will say that keeping a lake two feet on each side to the benefit within its normal limits are the same thing as raising it 34 feet above its normal limits, then my honourable friend has made a point.

He has said, Mr. Speaker, that this is a trial first and a verdict afterwards. I ask a verdict first, a trial afterwards. I have indicated and I indicated when I was in Opposition, I say nothing different now, that the government should not make a decision and then hold a trial to see whether that decision should be made. I have said that this government will not make a decision and then conduct a fraud on the people by holding a trial to see whether in fact we are going to make it appear that they are telling us what to do. However, there is a question of patterns and how those will affect the people, how their cottages will be affected, and I say we have not made a decision on that and it is good to have meetings before we make a decision on that - trial first, verdict afterwards. Trial first -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I made a deal with my honourable friend. I asked members of this House, I asked members in this House to watch us, and I said I wanted to see who was the first person that will interrupt the other person while he's on his feet and now all members -- it didn't take a night, it didn't take two hours, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I would ask honourable members-- the Minister of Finance had an undertaking to this committee. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, so the record will be clear, there was no deal made by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and myself. There was a statement made, you know, actually by him. Mr. Chairman, this is the same logic he's applying to the particular situation with respect to Lake Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Okay, I will accept the fact, I'll accept the fact because my honourable friend has now said it, that I said that for the rest of this session I will not interrupt, rudely interrupt my honourable friend when he is on his feet and he has said that he will continue to interrupt me when I am on my feet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. There's no point of order. Committee rise.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege - on the point of privilege, I have no objection to the debating quality or style of the Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. There's no point of privilege. The Minister of

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . . . Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that was the first complaint that I go against my principles about the verdict first, trial afterwards. I believe, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that on those issues which are open to review, we are holding a trial, we are holding hearings, what he would call it, on those decisions which the government has said it will accept responsibility for and which it has decided we are going into no sham of holding a trial which is what the previous administration did.

As to keeping one's options open, let's take the two situations. We have now the option of proceeding immediately to divert, to flood South Indian Lake by 15 feet and maybe some day using Lake Winnipeg regulation which we consider a benefit; or we have the option of proceeding with Lake Winnipeg regulation, which we know we will need in any event, and keeping the option open that we may be able to do even better than we have done on South Indian Lake, and as a trustee of the waters and as a trustee of the resources which my honourable friend says I am, I say that I am getting a better situation on Lake Winnipeg and I may even get a still better one on the Churchill River diversion. That's keeping my options open.

With regard, Mr. Chairman, to the suggestion that I said that there should be a royal commission, my honourable friend mixes apples, oranges, potatoes and everything else — (Interjection) — would I? Well, we now have the indication that my honourable friend is not able again to participate without — (Interjection) — you know, I agree, I agree, but you are bound by the rules of the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that I will be bound by them; my honourable friend says he won't make a deal to that effect.

The fact is that as far as an independent commission is concerned, at that time we were talking about the Legislature taking an administrative decision and the government refused to give us the information upon which that decision should be based, and I said that when a group of legislators are asked to decide a thing of this nature then they should have all of the advice that is available, a royal commission should be appointed, things of that nature should be brought in, and this should be done. The Legislature has never been asked to make the decision with Lake Winnipeg regulation. We have said from the outset that this is an administrative decision; we have said from the outset that we are going to make this decision; we have said from the outset that we will accept the responsibility for this decision; and if the members opposite say that we should not be making this decision administratively then they have their remedy, they can throw out the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I really have a problem, I don't know how to show a fraction of a dollar in the estimates and that bothers me in connection with the amendment. Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

#### IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines, that the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$2,300,000 for Mines and Resources and Environmental Management - Operations: Water Resources, Operations, Fishermen's Assistance, \$2,300,000.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$600,000 for Youth and Education - Student Aid and Human Resources Development; (d) Student Summer Employment projects, \$600,000, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . . Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it's 10:00 o'clock. There would have been no difficulty or any disagreement on this side. I curtailed my remarks on the assumption that we were going to be proceeding. I did not realize the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was going to answer. I think in view of that, and that was my unilateral understanding, I think we should proceed with this tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to have it understood that although my honourable friend would like to be able to not be replied to, there was no agreement on this side that he would not be replied to.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 10:00 o'clock. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is accordingly adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.